

Column 14, lines 35-37 the sentence beginning "Thus, in the. . ." in line 35 should be changed to read as follows:

B²
Thus, in the embodiments of FIGS. 4A-4E the flute pitch ratio diminishes linearly from [four] one at the [shank] tip to [one] .25 at the [tip] shank.

B³
Column 14, line 39 should be changed to read:

linear decrease in flute pitch ratio from [shank] tip to [tip] shank is preferred.

IN THE CLAIMS:

Cancel claim 10.

The above amendments are made without prejudice.

RECEIVED
JUN 13 2004
TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

REMARKS

Acceptance and entry of the above amendment is respectfully requested. This amendment is submitted to correct errors in the patent as issued. No new matter is involved.

In reviewing the specification, applicant has discovered inconsistent statements with respect to flute pitch ratio which is described in the patent in the paragraph beginning at column 14, line 27. In the beginning of that paragraph, flute pitch is stated as 0.5 flutes/mm. adjacent the largest diameter flute 62 and two flutes/mm. adjacent to tip 64. This means that the ratio of flute pitch at the tip to flute pitch at the shank ($2 \div 0.5$) is 4. The inconsistencies arose from mentally considering the flute pitch inversely during the preparation of the application of the patent. The above amendments are submitted to correct these

inconsistencies. The correct statements regarding flute pitch ratio can be readily discerned from a review of FIGS. 4 and 4G of the drawing.

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the courtesy extended to the attorney undersigned in a telephone interview with the Examiner on or about December 16, 2003. Nothing of substance was discussed, but the Examiner provided assistance in clarifying the Office Action.

election (The Examiner has defined separate species in the drawings. The set of files shown in FIGS. 7-11 and claimed in claims 1-9, 11-36 and 70 is denominated Species 1. Pursuant to requirement, applicant elects Species 1 and lists claims 1-9, 11-36 and 70 as reading thereon. It is understood that claims 37-69 are withdrawn as being directed to a non-elected species. It is applicant's intention to prosecute those claims in a Divisional Application, to be filed while the present application is still pending.

Applicant submits herewith a Supplemental Reissue Declaration on a form derived from the PTO web site. Acceptance of the Supplemental Reissue Declaration is solicited.

The Examiner may have overlooked the offer to surrender the original patent. In original papers filed in this application, it is listed as Item No. 6 in the Reissue Patent Application Transmittal form and may be found in the application papers about six sheets below that form. Thus, the requirement at the bottom of page 4 of the Office Action is believed obviated.

Applicant is gratified to note the indication that claims 1-9, 11-36 and 70 are allowable over the prior art.

Applicant has tried to prepare this Response to Office Action in compliance with applicable rules. It is hoped that the papers submitted will be now found acceptable. Favorable consideration is solicited.

Applicant is submitting concurrently herewith a proposed drawing correction which is believed to comply with 37 C.F.R. 173(b)(3). The Examiner's approval is solicited. In the event any problems still remain, applicant would appreciate a telephone call from the Examiner at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Henry M. Bissell
Registration No. 19,200

HMB/sk
Encl.

6820 La Tijera Boulevard
Suite 106
Los Angeles, CA 90045

(310) 645-1088